

**MINUTES
URBAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
ZONING ITEMS PUBLIC HEARING**

August 23, 2012

- I. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 2nd Floor LFUCG Government Center, 200 East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky.

Planning Commission members present: Eunice Beatty; Carla Blanton; Patrick Brewer; Mike Cravens; Karen Mundy; Mike Owens, Chair; Frank Penn; Carolyn Plumlee; and Lynn Roche-Phillips (arrived at 1:59). Absent were Will Berkley and Bill Wilson.

Planning staff members present: Dr. Derek Paulsen, Commissioner; Chris King, Director; Bill Sallee; Barbara Rackers; Jim Marx; Traci Wade; Tom Martin; Chris Taylor; and Stephanie Cunningham. Other staff members present were Tracy Jones, Department of Law; and Tim Queary, Urban Forester.

- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – A motion was made by Mr. Brewer, seconded by Ms. Beatty, and carried 8-0 (Berkley, Roche-Phillips, and Wilson absent) to approve the minutes of the July 12, 2012, and July 26, 2012, Planning Commission meetings.

III. **POSTPONEMENTS AND WITHDRAWALS**

- IV. **LAND SUBDIVISION ITEMS** - The Subdivision Committee met on Thursday, August 2, 2012, at 8:30 a.m. The meeting was attended by Commission members: Eunice Beatty, Will Berkley, Frank Penn, Carolyn Plumlee and Karen Mundy. Committee members in attendance were: Hillard Newman, Division of Engineering; and Jeff Neal, Division of Traffic Engineering. Staff members in attendance were: Bill Sallee, Tom Martin, Chris Taylor, Dave Jarman, Denise Bullock and Barbara Rackers, as well as Captain Charles Bowen, Division of Fire & Emergency Services and Tracy Jones, Department of Law. The Committee made recommendations on plans as noted.

General Notes

The following automatically apply to all plans listed on this agenda unless a waiver of any specific section is granted by the Planning Commission.

1. *All preliminary and final subdivision plans are required to conform to the provisions of Article 5 of the Land Subdivision Regulations.*
2. *All development plans are required to conform to the provisions of Article 21 of the Zoning Ordinance.*

1. **DP 2012-60: SEBASTIAN PROPERTY, UNIT 2 (9/29/12)*** - located at 2826 Leestown Road.
(Council District 2)

(EA Partners)

Note: This plan was postponed by the Planning Commission at its August 9, 2012, meeting.

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: **Postponement.** The plan is proposing some possible conditional uses and there is a question as to whether all the townhomes meet the minimum open space requirements.

Should this plan be approved, the following requirements should be considered:

1. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm and sanitary sewers.
2. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of street cross-sections and access.
3. Building Inspection's approval of landscaping and landscape buffers.
4. Addressing Office's approval of street names and addresses.
5. Urban Forester's approval of tree protection plan.
6. Department of Environmental Quality's approval of environmentally sensitive areas.
7. Bike & Pedestrian Planner's approval of bike trails and pedestrian facilities.
8. Greenspace Planner's approval of the treatment of greenways and greenspace.
9. Division of Fire's approval of emergency access and fire hydrant locations.
10. Division of Waste Management's approval of refuse collection.
11. Denote construction access location(s) and reference Engineering Manuals on plan.
12. Denote: No tree in an existing or planned greenway shall be removed without the prior approval of the Urban Forester.
13. Addition of clubhouse exterior dimensions.
14. Denote tree protection areas on adjacent LFUCG greenway lot.
15. Provided the Planning Commission makes a finding regarding the use of the access easements as sole access to lots.
16. Provided the Planning Commission grants a waiver to Article 4-8 of the Land Subdivision Regulations.
17. Revise 20' building line on Trailwood Lane.
18. Addition of proposed easements.
19. Discuss addition of building envelopes and/or building detail note.
20. Discuss compliance with (10% per lot) open space requirements or necessary variances.
21. Discuss proposed clubhouse and child care center uses.
22. Discuss "1/2 moon" parking lot potential conflict with right-of-way.
23. Discuss need for interior pedestrian connections between buildings.
24. Discuss proposed HOA areas.
25. Discuss the 20' building line on Trailwood Lane.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

Staff Comment: Mr. Martin stated that the staff had received an email from the applicant, requesting a three-week postponement of this item.

Action: A motion was made by Mr. Penn, seconded by Mr. Cravens, and carried 8-0 (Berkley, Roche-Phillips, and Wilson absent) to postpone DP 2012-60 to the September 13, 2012, Planning Commission meeting.

2. **ZOTA 2012-4: AMEND THE DEFINITION OF "BANQUET FACILITIES"** (10/2/12)* – petition for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to amend the definition of "banquet facilities" to delete the requirement that the use must take place within a building currently or formerly used as a residence.

REQUESTED BY: C Brothers, LLC

PROPOSED TEXT: (Note: Underlined text indicates an addition, ~~text dashed through~~ indicates a deletion to the current Zoning Ordinance.)

ARTICLE 1: GENERAL PROVISIONS AND DEFINITIONS

1-11 DEFINITIONS

BANQUET FACILITY - A building ~~currently or formerly used as a residence~~, made available to the public for holding meetings and social events. This use may include the sale of alcoholic beverages; indoor live entertainment; and may also include, as an accessory use, events conducted outside the main building in tents or other temporary facilities, subject to the issuance of a permit by the Division of Building Inspection.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Approval**, for the reasons provided by staff.

The Staff Recommended: **Approval**, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed text amendment to modify the definition of "banquet facilities" to remove the residence requirement is logical and appropriate because it allows for similar uses to be treated in a similar manner within the business zones.
2. Banquet facilities have been overly restricted in the past five years to the point that very few have been approved, even though demand exists.

Staff Comment: Mr. Sallee stated that the staff would like to request a one-month postponement of this item. He noted that the September meeting is the last meeting for which this item could be scheduled, due to the time limit by which the Planning Commission must consider Zoning Ordinance text amendments.

Action: A motion was made by Mr. Cravens, seconded by Ms. Mundy, and carried 8-0 (Berkley, Roche-Phillips, and Wilson absent) to postpone ZOTA 2012-4 to the September 27, 2012, Planning Commission meeting.

3. **ZOTA 2012-9: AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLES 1, 8 & 12 FOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (B-1) ZONE** – petition for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to make various modifications to the Neighborhood Business (B-1) zone, including several new definitions.

INITIATED BY: Urban County Planning Commission

PROPOSED TEXT: (*Copies of the proposed text are available upon request*)

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Approval with changes to permit miniature golf courses to remain a principal use in the B-1 zone**, for the reasons provided by staff.

The Staff Recommended: **Approval including the Staff Alternative Text**, for the following reasons:

1. The text amendment will be in agreement with the Implementation Element and Table of the 2007 Comprehensive Plan, which identified the "neighborhood business zone rewrite" as a necessary task following the completion of the *Non-Residential Infill Study*. The Study suggested adjusting land uses permitted within the Neighborhood Business (B-1) zone and relaxing setbacks and height limitations.
2. The proposed amendment meets many of the recommendations of the *Non-Residential Infill Study*, and accomplishes other minor improvements to the B-1 zone to make it more compatible with residential neighborhoods.
3. The creation of a "form-based neighborhood business project" will provide added flexibility for redevelopment in the Infill and Redevelopment Area, and provide for more compatible development with the existing character of an area.

Staff Comment: Mr. Sallee stated that the staff was requesting a postponement of this item to the Commission's December 13th meeting. He added that there is one combined meeting in December, due to the holidays.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

Action: A motion was made by Mr. Penn, seconded by Ms. Plumlee, and carried 8-0 (Berkley, Roche-Phillips, and Wilson absent) to postpone ZOTA 2012-9 to the December 13, 2012, Planning Commission meeting.

- V. **ZONING ITEMS** - The Zoning Committee met on Thursday, August 2, 2012, at 1:30 p.m. in the Division of Planning Office. The meeting was attended by Commission members Carla Blanton, Mike Cravens, and Patrick Brewer. The Committee reviewed applications, and made recommendations on zoning items as noted.

A. ABBREVIATED PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONE MAP AMENDMENTS AND RELATED PLANS

The staff will call for objectors to determine which petitions are eligible for abbreviated hearings.

Abbreviated public hearings will be held on petitions meeting the following criteria:

- The staff has recommended approval of the zone change petition and related plan(s)
- The petitioner concurs with the staff recommendations
- Petitioner waives oral presentation, but may submit written evidence for the record
- There are no objections to the petition

B. FULL PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONE MAP AMENDMENTS AND RELATED PLANS – Following abbreviated hearings, the remaining petitions will be considered.

The procedure for these hearings is as follows:

- Staff Reports (30 minute maximum)
- Petitioner's report(s) (30 minute maximum)
- Citizen Comments
 - (a) proponents (10 minute maximum OR 3 minutes each)
 - (b) objectors (30 minute maximum) (3 minutes each)
- Rebuttal & Closing Statements
 - (a) petitioner's comments (5 minute maximum)
 - (b) citizen objectors (5 minute maximum)
 - (c) staff comments (5 minute maximum)
- Hearing closed and Commission votes on zone change petition and related plan(s)

Note: Requests for additional time, stating the basis for the request, must be submitted to the staff no later than two days prior to the hearing. The Chair will announce its decision at the outset of the hearing.

1. **ZOTA 2012-11: AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIAL PROVISIONS OF THE CC ZONE** (1/2/13)*– petition for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to amend the requirements of the Community Center (CC) zone to allow a building to exceed 50,000 square feet in size.

REQUESTED BY: A & M Hamburg, LLC

PROPOSED TEXT: (Note: Text underlined is an addition to the current Zoning Ordinance.)

ARTICLE 23A – EXPANSION AREAS ZONING CATEGORIES AND RESTRICTIONS

23A-9 COMMUNITY CENTER (CC) ZONE

23A-9(k) SPECIAL PROVISIONS

1. At least 25% of the net developable acreage of any development within a CC zone shall be open space.
2. At least 40% of the aggregated floor area of buildings within a development in a CC zone shall be devoted to residential uses as permitted in EAR-3 and schools, churches and their accessory structures, and public buildings.
3. No building shall exceed 15,000 square feet in floor area unless:
 - a. the building contains a mix of residential and non-residential uses; or
 - b. the building is designed and intended to be used for a school, church or public building; or
 - c. the building is designed and intended to be used principally as a store selling food, produce and other grocery items (not primarily general merchandise) and not exceeding 50,000 square feet.
 - d. One additional building exceeding 50,000 square feet which is designed and intended to be used primarily as a store selling general merchandise, including food, produce and other grocery items, shall be permitted provided it is located within a CC zone containing at least 30 net contiguous acres, provided that the CC zone immediately adjoins and has frontage on an interstate interchange, and provided that such building is part of an integrated development governed by a single development plan.
4. Parking areas shall be designed so as to minimize the placement of parking between the buildings and the adjoining streets.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

5. Each development within a CC zone shall have access to a pedestrian accessway.
6. Each development shall provide suitable facilities for the parking of bicycles.
7. The development shall be screened from adjoining zones as for a business zone under Article 18-3(a)(1).
8. Structures shall be sited to avoid the rear of the building facing a street (other than an alley) to the greatest extent practicable.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Approval of the staff alternative text**, for the reasons provided by staff.

Staff Alternative Text:

ARTICLE 23A – EXPANSION AREAS ZONING CATEGORIES AND RESTRICTIONS

23A-9 COMMUNITY CENTER (CC) ZONE

23A-9(k) SPECIAL PROVISIONS

1. At least 25% of the net developable acreage of any development within a CC zone shall be open space.
2. At least 40% of the aggregated floor area of buildings within a development in a CC zone shall be devoted to residential uses as permitted in EAR-3; ~~and~~ schools, churches and their accessory structures; and public buildings.
3. No building shall exceed 15,000 square feet in floor area unless:
 - a. the building contains a mix of residential and non-residential uses; or
 - b. the building is designed and intended to be used for a school, church or public building; or
 - c. the building is designed and intended to be used principally as a store selling food, produce and other grocery items (not primarily general merchandise) and not exceeding 50,000 square feet; and
 - d. one additional building exceeding 50,000 square feet that is designed and intended to be used primarily as a store selling general merchandise, including food, produce and other grocery items, but only under the following conditions:
 1. the proposed building shall be located within a CC zone containing at least 30 net contiguous acres, and that has frontage on an interstate interchange;
 2. the building shall be part of an integrated development governed for all contiguously zoned CC land (excluding right-of-way) by a single development plan; and
 3. any building exceeding 80,000 square feet in size shall also adhere to the "Design Guidelines for 'Big-Box' Establishments," excluding guideline numbers 6 and 14, which are contrary to other provisions of the CC zone. Such design guidelines shall be met unless waived by the Planning Commission through its approval of a final development plan.
4. Parking areas shall be designed so as to minimize the placement of parking between the buildings and the adjoining streets.
5. Each development within a CC zone shall have access to a pedestrian accessway.
6. Each development shall provide suitable facilities for the parking of bicycles.
7. The development shall be screened from adjoining zones as for a business zone under Article 18-3(a)(1).
8. Structures shall be sited to avoid the rear of the building facing a street (other than an alley) to the greatest extent practicable.

The Staff Recommends: **Approval of the Staff Alternative Text**, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed text amendment to the special provisions of the Community Center (CC) zone will allow the option for a larger retail use in a CC area that meets the criteria, while still complying with the intent of the zone and the Community Center (CC) land use category.
2. As defined in the 2007 Comprehensive Plan, a mix of uses will still be required in CC areas to meet the needs of the surrounding neighborhoods.

Staff Presentation: Ms. Wade began the staff's presentation by noting that the staff had distributed a staff exhibit packet and a letter of opposition to this proposed text amendment. She stated that the petitioner is proposing a text amendment to Article 29 in order to amend the special provisions of the Community Center (CC) zone to allow buildings larger than 50,000 square feet under the three circumstances: the property has a minimum of 30 contiguous acres of CC-zoned land; the property is located adjacent to an interstate interchange; and the property is part of an integrated development governed by a single development plan.

Ms. Wade stated that the CC zone is only permitted in the Expansion Area. She explained that the Expansion Area Master Plan, which was adopted as part of the 1996 Comprehensive Plan, was the product of a long-term, collaborative effort that involved a great deal of citizen input. It established a new approach to development by proposing to divide large tracts of developable land into separate communities, each of which would have a mix of housing, community facilities and

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

commercial development, as well as areas set aside for economic development. Within the EAMP, there are seven land use categories, one of which is the Community Center category. The EAMP designated four CC areas, on five properties: Hamburg; Sikura-Justice; Blackford; Gess; and Newmarket.

Ms. Wade said that the definition of the CC land use category established by the EAMP has carried forward to the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. It addresses the idea that Community Centers should have a horizontal or vertical mixture of uses, including retail, office, and residential, as well as institutional uses and public spaces. The CC zone was developed to implement the Community Center land use category, and its intent from (Article 23A-9) reads: "Implementing the land use category by providing a mixture of residential and non-residential uses which serve the needs of the surrounding neighborhoods." Ms. Wade explained that the commercial uses in CC zones are permitted "by right," but the buildings are limited by size restrictions. Any building in that zone can be up to 15,000 square feet in size. If a mixture of uses is provided in a single building, then there is no size limit. The Special Provisions of the CC zone allow for a grocery store to be up to 50,000 square feet in size. The original Zoning Ordinance language for the CC zone, drafted in 1996, intended to create mixed-use neighborhoods, with the possibility of a small grocery store located internally, surrounded by residential dwelling units.

Ms. Wade explained that, since the properties in the Expansion Area were rezoned, few of the areas with the CC zoning designation have developed as originally planned. The Providence Place CC area was unplanned, but was approved by the Urban County Council to provide for commercial uses in Expansion Area 3. That area remains mostly undeveloped, with the exception of a small parking lot, which serves an adjacent hotel. The second diversion from the planned CC areas is located on the Hamburg property, where the CC land was moved to an alternate location. That property also remains undeveloped. Ms. Wade noted that the staff believes that CC land has developed slowly, and not to its full potential.

Ms. Wade stated that the existing CC lands are in the following locations:

- 1) In Expansion Area 2a, on the Hamburg East Property at the intersection of Polo Club Boulevard, Man O' War Boulevard, and Interstate 75. The property has 37.5 total developable acres, which are currently vacant.
- 2) Split between the Sikura-Justice and Blackford Properties in Expansion Area 2a. The CC area on the Sikura-Justice Property is 8.21 acres in size, and is currently occupied by a bank, pharmacy, and gas station, with additional residential and retail uses planned. The portion on the Blackford Property is 29.8 acres in size, and is currently vacant.
- 3) In Expansion Area 2b on the Newmarket property at the intersection of Todds Road and the planned extension of Polo Club Boulevard. The CC area in that location is 4.27 acres in size, with a townhouse residential development already constructed and construction of a medical office underway.
- 4) On the Gess Property, at the intersection of Hays Boulevard and Sperling Drive in Expansion Area 2c. That CC area is 9.36 acres in size, with a multi-family residential development currently underway.
- 5) In Expansion Area 3 on Providence Place Parkway, that property is 6.95 acres in size, and it is currently mostly vacant. There are existing development plan for retail, gas station, and residential uses.

Ms. Wade said that, in evaluating the petitioner's proposed text amendment, the staff considered that there had been a significant realignment of the Hamburg Property CC zone, and now that the property adjoins Interstate 75, it is bordered on three sides by significant roadways. Is no longer internally situated in relation to the surrounding residential area; and is no longer integrated in the existing greenway system, which is intended to connect the neighborhoods.

Ms. Wade said that, except for the size restrictions, the petitioner's proposal would not alter any of the existing Special Provisions of the CC zone, including the provision of common open space and the requirement that at least 40% of the total floor area for the development be dedicated to non-commercial land uses, such as residential, or churches, schools, or other public uses. In addition, the proposed text amendment would limit larger buildings in the CC zones to just one big-box establishment or anchor store, and those large commercial buildings would have to adhere to the guidelines for big-box establishments.

Ms. Wade stated that the staff believes that, after 16 years of minimal development in the CC zones, there should be a change made to the zoning regulations. The staff also believes it is important that the petitioner's proposal is self-limiting, and the petitioner is agreeable to providing big-box amenities for the proposed development. Ms. Wade said that the staff is therefore recommending approval of the applicant's request, along with a proposed staff alternative text, which is listed in the staff report and on the agenda. The staff alternative text recommends including big-box standards as required for other business zones for buildings that exceed 80,000 square feet. There were two big-box guidelines, #6 and #14, that the staff felt were contrary to the other Special Provisions of the CC zone, so those should not be required for big-box stores in the CC zone. Ms. Wade stated that the Zoning Committee also recommended approval of the staff alternative for this request.

Commission Questions: Mr. Penn asked if this proposed text amendment would apply to the entirety of the CC-zoned area

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

on the Hamburg Property. Ms. Wade answered that it would apply to all of the CC zones. Mr. Penn asked Ms. Wade to confirm that no more than one big-box structure would be allowed on the 37.5-acre property. Ms. Wade responded affirmatively.

Mr. Owens asked how the staff arrived at the 80,000 square-foot recommendation for big-box stores in the CC zone. Ms. Wade answered that, in the B-6P zone, the guidelines are established to apply to buildings at least 80,000 square feet in size. So, in the other business zones, a big-box store is essentially defined as anything over 80,000 square feet. Ms. Wade added that, when the design guidelines were initially adopted, there were discussions between property owners, the staff, and the Planning Commission to establish the 80,000 square-foot requirement for big-box structures. The staff believed that it would be consistent, since the big-box design guidelines reference the 80,000 square-foot requirement, that the CC zone should be consistent with the remainder of the Ordinance. Mr. Owens asked if the staff would be willing to consider requiring the big-box standards, in CC zones only, to become applicable at 50,000 square feet, rather than 80,000. Ms. Wade answered that the staff would be agreeable to that change.

Petitioner Representation: Rena Wiseman, attorney, was present representing the petitioner. She stated that the petitioner is in agreement with the proposed staff alternative text.

Ms. Wiseman said that the proposed text amendment will not change the residential and open space components of the current regulations for the CC zone. It also would not allow for more retail square footage in that zone. It would, however, allow a developer the flexibility to reconfigure developable retail space that could otherwise be a grocery store and several other shops into one location. The petitioner contends that, due to the nature of the proposed retail tenant, many of the goods and services that would normally be available from a number of smaller shops in a Community Center could be provided in one larger structure. That would allow for a more efficient use of the land; and the retailer in question could, in turn, provide significant discounts on those goods and services for their members. Ms. Wiseman also noted that the proposed text amendment would not add new uses or permit additional square footage to buildings in the CC zone.

Ms. Wiseman stated that this text amendment was proposed as a means to provide the community with the opportunity to attract an outstanding company with the possibility of economic development, since the proposed retailer could bring at least 200 jobs. She added that the proposed retailer is not requesting any state or local government incentives for their location in Lexington-Fayette County.

Note: Ms. Roche-Phillips arrived at this time.

Jackie Frank, Vice-President of real estate development, Costco Wholesale, stated that the company is an international chain of warehouse clubs that provides merchandise at a discount via its membership-only stores. He said that the company tailors its products and services specifically toward small and medium-size businesses, for their own use as well as resale, to help them reduce their operating costs. Costco pays their employees a "living wage," which results in low turnover and greater job satisfaction, as well as enabling employees to give back to their communities through charitable donations and volunteerism.

Mr. Frank stated that Costco abides by a code of ethics that involves: obeying the law; taking care of their members; taking care of their employees; and respecting their suppliers, all of which results in rewards for their shareholders. He said that, based on global sales data, the company is the second-largest retailer in the United States and the seventh-largest in the world, ranking at #24 in the Fortune 500. Sales in 2011 were approximately \$87 billion, with fiscal year 2012 earnings projected at \$97 billion. Each warehouse store averages about \$146 million in sales each year. Mr. Frank said that Costco employ nearly 170,000 people worldwide in 607 stores, which are located in the United States, Canada, Mexico, the United Kingdom, Europe, Asia, and Australia. There are approximately 67 million club members worldwide, with two different "tiers" of membership and a 90% renewal rate. The average hourly wage for Costco employees in the United States is \$20.51 per hour, with approximately 90% of the positions being benefit-eligible. Mr. Frank stated that, after five years of employment, a cashier can earn nearly \$49,000 a year in salary and bonuses. The company believes that the generous salary contributes to high employee satisfaction, which is demonstrated by their less than 6% turnover rate for employees who have been with the company for more than a year.

Mr. Frank stated, with regard to the company's merchandise, that Costco is considered the largest seller of fine wines in the world, with \$1.3 billion in wine sales last year. The company is known for its high-quality foods, with \$4.6 billion in meat sales last year, as well as fine seafood and bakery items made from scratch. In addition, Costco operates a sustainable program for sourcing fresh produce from 41 countries, with nearly \$4 billion in produce sales in the last fiscal year. Their stores also include pharmacies and optical shops, with 3.2 million pairs of glasses sold in fiscal year 2011 and a ranking as one of the top opticians in the United States. As part of their efforts to provide high-quality goods at the lowest prices, Costco developed their own private label products that they believe are as good as, or better than, most national brands.

Mr. Frank said that, at the time that most Zoning Ordinances were developed, retail/wholesale warehouse stores such as Costco did not exist. He stated that there are already a large number of Costco members in the Lexington area who currently shop at their stores in Louisville and Cincinnati, so the company believes that this would be the perfect market for them to construct a new facility. In addition, the concentration of small businesses and a viable large market should contribute to the

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

success of the proposed store. When considering possible sites for new stores, Costco looks for properties that are zoned appropriately, have site services and utilities, are easily developable, and have access to a regional roadway system. Mr. Frank stated that Costco is a "regional draw," with customers often traveling long distances to their stores, so easy access to the roadway system is critical to their success. He added that Costco is compatible with many other uses, including residential uses, so the proposed store should fit well with any of the other CC zone uses. Mr. Frank added that he had reviewed all of the Big-Box Design Guidelines, and that the Costco development plan can comply with and possibly exceed those requirements.

Commission Questions: Mr. Penn asked how many acres of the 37.5 site they are reviewing would be used for the proposed Costco store. Mr. Frank answered that between 15 and 16 acres would be needed to accommodate the warehouse store as well as the required parking, landscaping, and drainage system.

Mr. Owens asked, with regard to his earlier question to the staff, if the petitioner would be willing to set the threshold for the big-box guidelines to take effect in the CC zones at 50,000 square feet, rather than 80,000. Ms. Wiseman answered that the petitioner would be agreeable to that change. Mr. Owens stated that he believes that it would be a benefit to the CC zone overall to have that threshold set at 50,000 square feet.

Mr. Penn asked how the staff envisioned the remainder of the 37 acres being used. Ms. Wade answered that the staff would anticipate some multi-family residential development. She added that the 2007 Comprehensive Plan identified a location for a middle school on the Hamburg property; when the property was rezoned, however, Fayette County Public Schools did not reserve that space for a school. Patrick Madden, petitioner, said that he believes that the development could contain restaurants and the residential uses necessary to meet the requirements of the CC zone. He added that he would like for the proposed development to model the "village-type atmosphere" that he believes is the intent of the CC zone. Mr. Penn said that he hopes that the proposed development will be successful, since he believes that, if it is, it could serve as a model for future development for the other CC zones in Lexington-Fayette County.

Ms. Roche-Phillips asked if 40% of the CC area is required to be used for residences. Ms. Wade responded that 40% of the development is required to be non-commercial. Ms. Roche-Phillips asked how that number is measured. Ms. Wade answered that the 40% is calculated by floor area. Ms. Roche-Phillips asked, based on those calculations, how much of the 37 acres of the proposed development would be for non-commercial uses. Ms. Wade responded that it would be difficult to calculate, since there can be a vertical element, particularly in multi-family structures. She added that the staff had done some calculations, and determined that, if the proposed Costco store were to be 150,000 square feet in size, then the petitioner would be required to construct 100,000 square feet of non-commercial uses in order to meet the 60/40 requirement. Ms. Roche-Phillips asked if the petitioner would be required to address how that balance will be achieved at this stage in the process. Ms. Wade responded that the petitioner would address that issue on their preliminary or final development plan, and the staff would review the proposed mixture of uses at that time, and she added that the plan would have to include that information in order to demonstrate that it could meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Beatty asked, with regard to the opposition email the staff distributed to the Commission members, if the staff had met with the Gleneagles Owners Association and attempted to address their concerns. Ms. Wade answered that the staff had received that email on the morning of this meeting. She explained that the email did not represent the Gleneagles Owners Association; it was submitted by an individual who resides in the neighborhood. Ms. Wade said that Mr. Sallee attended a neighborhood meeting a few days before this hearing, and he could elaborate on what type of discussion took place. Mr. Sallee stated that the meeting, which was attended mostly by the Board of the homeowners' association, lasted approximately 90 minutes. The petitioner and their representative were present as well. The staff provided information about the proposed text amendment, and distributed copies of their staff report. Mr. Sallee said that the Board members were concerned about the development meeting the required 60/40 mixture of uses, as well as how the proposed development might be configured on the final development plan. He noted that he did not stay until the end of the meeting, so he was not aware if the Board made any decisions or took a vote on the issue. The email to which Ms. Beatty referred was the only communication the staff received with regard to this request, although two of the homeowners' association board members have since asked to be notified at the time of the filing of a final development plan for the property. Mr. Sallee said that the staff placed copies of those requests in the file for the zoning development plan for the property, and agreed that they would provide notification of the filing of the development plan.

Mr. Owens asked if Costco would be the only commercial use on the subject property. Ms. Wade answered that the staff would anticipate additional complementary uses on the property as well.

Mr. Brewer stated that there had been a great deal of discussion about this request at the Commission's most recent work session, and he believed that it had been deliberate and necessary. He added that he appreciated the work that the staff and petitioner had put into resolving the Commission's concerns about this proposed text amendment; and, although there are some process issues that need to be addressed, he believes that this item should be recommended for approval, in order to allow the petitioner to move forward with the proposed development.

Motion: A motion was made by Mr. Brewer and seconded by Ms. Beatty to approve ZOTA 2012-11, for the reasons provided

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

by staff.

Discussion of Motion: Mr. Owens asked if Mr. Brewer's motion referred to approval of the staff alternative text, with which Mr. Brewer agreed. Mr. Owens asked if Mr. Brewer would be willing to lower the big-box guideline threshold for the CC zone from 80,000 square feet to 50,000 square feet. Mr. Brewer answered that he was not very concerned about that issue, but he would be willing to consider it.

Mr. Penn stated that the proposed language to which Mr. Owens referred would require that structures over 50,000 square feet in size in a CC zone be required to adhere to the Big-Box Design Guidelines.

Ms. Roche-Phillips stated that she would not support this proposed text amendment, since she believes that it would be contrary to the Commission's purpose in comprehensive planning. She added that the CC zone was intended to include village-type neighborhood development, not regional destination shopping, and the Planning Commission has a responsibility to consider the future impacts of their decisions.

Mr. Owens asked if Mr. Brewer would be willing to amend his motion to include the big-box threshold at 50,000 square feet, rather than 80,000. Mr. Brewer responded that he would be willing, if the other Commission members were in support of that change. Ms. Beatty said that she would be agreeable.

Mr. Cravens said that he did not believe that a 50,000 square-foot building would be large enough to incorporate all of the elements of the Big-Box Design Guidelines. He said these would trigger bus stops, parking and designs on the outside of these boxes. He added that he likely would not support the proposed change to 50,000 square feet.

Mr. Brewer said that he did not have strong feelings either way, but he did not want the proposed text amendment to hamstring other developments, with all due respect to Ms. Roche-Phillips' concerns.

Mr. Owens stated that his concern stems from the fact that there are currently no big-box requirements for any structures in the CC zone.

Mr. Brewer asked if the staff had a recommendation with regard to the big-box concerns. Ms. Wade answered that the staff recommendation was 80,000 square feet.

Mr. Brewer stated that he would like to leave his motion intact, to approve ZOTA 2012-11, with the staff alternative text as written, for the reasons provided by staff. Ms. Beatty said that she would second that amendment to the motion.

Action: Mr. Brewers' motion carried, 5-4 (Mundy, Owens, Plumlee, and Roche-Phillips opposed; Berkley and Wilson absent).

2. PLEASANT GREEN BAPTIST CHURCH OF LEXINGTON, INC., ZONING MAP AMENDMENT & PLEASANT GREEN BAPTIST CHURCH OF LEXINGTON ZONING DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- a. MAR 2012-11: PLEASANT GREEN BAPTIST CHURCH OF LEXINGTON, INC. (9/29/12)* - petition for a zone map amendment from a High Density Apartment (R-4) zone to a Downtown Center Business (B-2B) zone, for 1.86 net (2.46 gross) acres, for property located at 410 Patterson Street and 522 & 540 West Maxwell Street.

LAND USE PLAN AND PROPOSED USE

The 2007 Comprehensive Plan (Sector 5) recommends a combination of Semi-Public Facilities (SP) and High Density Residential (HD) future land use for the subject property. The Semi-Public Facilities land use encompasses the parcels located at 540 W. Maxwell Street and 410 Patterson Street, and a small portion of 522 W. Maxwell Street; while the High Density Residential recommendation encompasses most of the 522 W. Maxwell Street parcel. The petitioner is requesting a B-2B zone in order to significantly expand the existing church on the subject site, and proposes to limit the use of the property with conditional zoning restrictions.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Approval**, for the reasons provided by staff.

The Staff Recommends: **Approval** for the following reason:

1. The existing High Density Apartment (R-4) zone is inappropriate, and the requested Lexington Center Business (B-2B) zone is appropriate for the subject property, for the following reasons:
 - a. The subject property immediately adjoins B-2B zoning to the northwest and the northeast, and much of the remaining surrounding property is non-residential within this portion of the downtown.
 - b. The subject property has not been used for residential purposes for many years; and, until recently, half of the site was occupied by a non-conforming tobacco warehouse.
 - c. Churches and their accessory uses are principal permitted uses in the B-2B zone, and it is more appropriate to be located within a zone that will allow this well-established church to continue as a principal use at this location. Many similarly situated downtown churches are located within the B-2, B-A or B-2B zones, which

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

- allows the flexibility to utilize their land efficiently and to minimize off-street parking requirements for a mostly off-peak time use.
- d. The 2012 Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives are furthered by the church use expansion and their planned support of the surrounding community, including Theme A.2a. (context-sensitive infill and redevelopment); Theme A.3b. (positive and safe social interactions in neighborhoods); and Theme D.2. (accessible community facilities and services).
 2. This recommendation is made subject to approval and certification of ZDP 2012-64: Pleasant Green Baptist Church of Lexington prior to forwarding a recommendation to the Urban County Council. This certification must be accomplished within two weeks of the Planning Commission's approval.
 3. Under the provisions of Article 6-7 of the Zoning Ordinance, the following uses shall be restricted on the subject property via conditional zoning:
PROHIBITED USES:
 1. Cocktail lounges and nightclubs.
 2. Automobile service stations.
 3. Establishments for the display, rental, and sale of automobiles, motorcycles, trucks and boats.

These use restrictions are necessary and appropriate for the subject property to ensure that the proposed zoning will stay consistent with the existing character of the area, while still allowing for development that would be compatible with future redevelopment projects in the downtown area.

- b. ZDP 2012-64: PLEASANT GREEN BAPTIST CHURCH OF LEXINGTON (9/29/12)* - located at 410 Patterson Street & 522 and 540 W. Maxwell Street.
(Endris Engineering)

The Subdivision Committee Recommended: **Approval**, subject to the following conditions:

1. Provided the Urban County Council rezones the property B-2B; otherwise, any Commission action of approval is null and void.
2. Urban County Engineer's acceptance of drainage, storm and sanitary sewers and floodplain information.
3. Urban County Traffic Engineer's approval of parking, circulation, access and street cross-sections.
4. Building Inspection's approval of landscaping and landscape buffers.
5. Urban Forester's approval of tree preservation plan.
6. Denote construction access location.
7. Complete notes #3 & #9.
8. Addition of conditional zoning restrictions, as necessary.
9. Revise notes #5 & #7.
10. Revise note regarding "impervious area."
11. Resolve Dunaway Street improvements at the time of a Final Development Plan for the property.

Zoning Presentation: Ms. Wade presented the staff report for this request, noting that the petitioner is proposing to rezone three pieces of property from R-4 to B-2B. She explained that the subject property includes 410 Patterson Street, and 522 and 540 Maxwell Street, which comprise the entire block bordered by West Maxwell, Patterson, Pine, and Dunaway Streets. The subject property is located, located just across West Maxwell Street from the Rupp Arena High Street parking lot. The Historic South Hill and Woodward Heights neighborhoods, both of which have H-1 zoning overlays, are nearby. Zoning in the vicinity of the subject property includes R-4 along Pine Street; B-2B along West Maxwell Street; and R-4 and B-4 along the other streets adjacent to the subject property. There is a mixture of uses in the area, including the Rupp Arena parking lot across West Maxwell Street and several small warehouses on Dunaway Street.

Ms. Wade stated that the petitioner is currently using nearly half of the subject property for their church building and associated parking; the remainder of the property is vacant. It was formerly used as a warehouse, which had a 0' setback on its Dunaway Street frontage. The petitioner is requesting to rezone the property to B-2B in order to construct a large addition to the church building, that would accommodate a gymnasium, fellowship hall, kitchen, and Sunday school classrooms, but they are not proposing to add any seating in the church sanctuary. The petitioner does plan to offer space for community meetings, youth activities, and other outreach programs that are consistent with the mission of the church and support the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Wade added that the church has been meeting at this location since 1822, and the existing building was constructed in 1931.

Ms. Wade said that the B-2B zone permits churches and Sunday Schools as principal uses, but it does not explicitly allow a community center use. That would allow the petitioner to hold meetings there, but would not permit an outside organization to be located on the site. The petitioner is also proposing conditional zoning restrictions that would prohibit cocktail lounges; nightclubs; automobile service stations; and establishments for the sale, rental and display of automobiles, motorcycles, trucks and boats. These restrictions are proposed in order for the church to remain consistent with the existing character of the area, including the residential uses. Ms. Wade displayed several photographs of the subject property, including: 1) a view of the existing church from Maxwell Street; 2) a view of the exist-

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

ing parking behind the church, looking toward Pine Street; and 3) a view of the right side of the parking lot and the area where the warehouse was formerly located, from Pine Street.

Ms. Wade stated that the 2007 Comprehensive Plan recommends High Density Residential use for most of 522 West Maxwell Street, but the other two parcels and the remaining small piece of 522 are recommended for Semi-Public Facilities land use, which corresponds with the area currently occupied by the church. This split recommendation was a result of the Newtown Pike Extension Corridor Plan, which was adopted by the Planning Commission in 2003 and incorporated into the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. More recently, the Rupp Arena Arts & Entertainment District Master Plan referenced plans for the High Street parking lot to remain flexible in order to address the market demands following the implementation of the higher-priority aspects of the Master Plan. Ms. Wade explained that the petitioner contends that the proposed B-2B zone is more appropriate for the subject property than the existing R-4 zone. The staff is in agreement with that assertion, for the reasons as listed in the staff report and on the agenda. Ms. Wade added that there are several similarly-situated churches downtown in the B-2 zones, which allow them some flexibility to use their land efficiently. She said that the staff and the Zoning Committee recommended approval of this request, subject to the conditional zoning restrictions as listed in the staff report and on the agenda.

Development Plan Presentation: Mr. Taylor presented corollary zoning development plan, which depicts a three-story addition to the existing church building, which is 8,400 square feet in size, for a total of 61,000 square feet. The plan also depicts a new canopy; a new parking lot at Maxwell and Dunaway Streets; and access to Patterson, Pine, and Dunaway Streets.

Mr. Taylor stated that the Subdivision Committee recommended approval of this plan, subject to the 11 conditions as listed on the agenda. He explained that condition #11 reflects the concerns of the Division of Traffic Engineering, expressed at the Technical Committee meeting, about the lack of a full cross-section of Dunaway Street in the area where the petitioner proposes to construct the church addition all the way up to the right-of-way. The nature and scope of those improvements will have to be discussed at the time of a Final Development Plan for the property.

Commission Question: Mr. Owens asked if there is currently a building at the right-of-way on the subject property. Mr. Taylor answered that the former warehouse on the property was constructed at the right-of-way. Mr. Owens asked if there is room for improvements to that roadway. Mr. Taylor responded that the staff of the Division of Traffic Engineering believes that there is adequate space for sidewalks and curbing in that area. He added that there has been some discussion about exploring the possibility of the full closure of Dunaway Street, since that part of it functioned more as an alley to serve the warehouses, and it does not match up with the cross-section on the other side of the Pine Street intersection.

Petitioner Representation: Rena Wiseman, attorney, was present representing the petitioner. She stated that the proposed rezoning will offer the church its first opportunity for a major expansion since its location on the subject property in 1822. The petitioner's purchase of the former warehouse building next door provided the land necessary to construct a fellowship center, kitchen, gymnasium, and Sunday school space and to enhance the existing access to the church for elderly and disabled members. The proposed plan includes a covered canopy area, away from Maxwell Street, where members can be dropped off. Ms. Wiseman stated that the petitioner believes that they are an "anchor" to the surrounding neighborhood, and the proposed expansion will allow them to offer more services to their neighbors.

Ms. Wiseman said that the petitioner is in agreement with the staff's recommendations, including the conditions for approval of the development plan. With regard to condition #11, she said that the petitioner is amenable to the dedication of some additional right-of-way, but they believe it would be appropriate to address the Dunaway Street improvements at the time of a Final Development Plan, when the final design of the building has been determined. Ms. Wiseman thanked the Commission for their consideration, and she requested approval.

Commission Question: Mr. Penn asked if the petitioner intends to request the closure of Dunaway Street. Ms. Wiseman answered that that option was suggested by Mr. Neal at the Subdivision Committee meeting, but the petitioner had not previously considered it. Mr. Penn opined that it would be inconsistent to request closure of the right-of-way, and install sidewalks.

Ms. Roche-Phillips asked if rezoning the subject property would require conditional use approval from the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Wiseman responded that it would not; it would make the church a principal permitted use.

Citizen Comment: There were no citizens present to comment on this item.

Zoning Action: A motion was made by Ms. Blanton, seconded by Ms. Roche-Phillips, and carried 9-0 (Berkley and Wilson absent) to approve MAR 2012-11, for the reasons provided by staff, subject to the conditional zoning restrictions as recommended by staff.

Development Plan Action: A motion was made by Ms. Blanton, seconded by Ms. Roche-Phillips, and carried 9-0 (Berkley and Wilson absent) to approve ZDP 2012-64, subject to the 11 conditions as listed on the agenda.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT REQUESTS

Note: The following item was continued from the June 28, 2012, Planning Commission public hearing.

1. **ZOTA 2012-12: OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS IN A “PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED BUSINESS DISTRICT”** – petition for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to Article 16 to clarify off-street parking requirements when the Urban County Council designates a “Pedestrian-Oriented Business District.”

INITIATED BY: Urban County Council

PROPOSED TEXT: Text underlined indicates an addition to the current Zoning Ordinance.

ARTICLE 16: GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR PARKING, LOADING AREAS, GARAGES, AUTOMOBILE SERVICE STATIONS, VEHICLE SALES LOTS AND STACKING AREAS

16-11 EFFECT OF PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED BUSINESS DISTRICT – For any such district created under Code of Ordinances Article 18, Chapter XIII, the provisions of the district will take precedence over any off-street parking requirements or related provisions contained in the Zoning Ordinance.

The Zoning Committee Recommended: **Approval**, for the reason provided by staff.

The Staff Recommends: **Approval**, for the following reason:

1. The text amendment to Article 16 will clarify that a designation of the new “Pedestrian-Oriented Business District” and the modification of off-street parking requirements as established by the Urban County Council will take precedence over the Zoning Ordinance. The amendment will minimize confusion and will likely reduce staff and administrative time spent in enforcement actions in the future.

Staff Presentation: Ms. Wade presented the staff report for this proposed amendment to Article 16 of the Zoning Ordinance, noting that the staff had received one letter of support, from the Fayette Alliance. This text amendment would add a new section to Article 16 to clarify that off-street parking requirements in Council-designated Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts would fall within the purview of the Urban County Council and the Code of Ordinances, rather than the Planning Commission and the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Wade explained that the Ordinance creating the Pedestrian-Oriented Business District designation was approved by the Council in April of 2012. This proposed text amendment would provide a clarifying statement in the Zoning Ordinance to denote that the Code of Ordinances takes precedence in those areas, rather than the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Wade said that the staff believes that this would be a more efficient way of addressing parking requirements in older commercial areas such as the Jefferson Street, South Limestone Street, or the Woodland triangle areas. Currently, the Board of Adjustment is required to consider individual variances to parking requirements in some instances, while in others parking requirements are met by way of lease agreements, which can be cumbersome to track and maintain. The staff also believes that this proposed text amendment could reduce staff administrative time spent in enforcement actions, and minimize confusion about which set of standards might apply in a given situation. Ms. Wade stated that the staff and the Zoning Committee are recommending approval of this text amendment, for the reasons as listed in the staff report and on the agenda.

Citizen Comment: Diane Lawless, Third District Councilmember, stated that she had been working on the proposed text amendment with the staff and the Department of Law for some time, beginning with conversations about the commercial area on South Limestone Street between Avenue of Champions and South Maxwell Street. She said that some of the businesses in that area do not have parking requirements because they have been grandfathered, but others have metered parking along Jersey and South Limestone Streets. In addition, some of the businesses, even with a parking reduction by the Board of Adjustment, pay hundreds of dollars each month to lease spaces in the Jersey Street parking lot from the University of Kentucky. Because of those high parking costs, some new companies have been reluctant to locate in that area, particularly since pedestrians would provide the bulk of their business. Ms. Lawless stated that she contacted business owners and neighborhood associations in the vicinity of South Limestone Street, nearly all of whom were in favor of the proposed amendment to the parking restrictions. They then began the process to determine the best means by which to control parking requirements without actually rezoning the properties. Ms. Lawless said that she believes that the proposed text amendment will provide a more appropriate way to address parking in designated Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts, and will aid in local economic development efforts by encouraging new businesses to locate in those areas.

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

Commission Questions: Mr. Penn asked if business owners in a given area would need to petition Council to designate a Pedestrian-Oriented Business District, and what would happen after such a district was designated. Ms. Wade answered that the Council could designate a specific parking requirement for that area. Mr. Penn asked if the Planning Commission would hear those requests. Ms. Wade responded that the Planning Commission would not be required to review the parking decisions of the Council, but any changes to the parking requirements would need to be denoted on a development plan, should such a district be created by the Council.

Director Comments: Mr. King added that the Council did outline a process for the designation of Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts. Specific addresses must be proposed, and notification must be sent to surrounding property owners, in order to ensure that each proposal is properly vetted prior to the Council taking any action.

Discussion: Ms. Beatty asked if this procedure would take place at the time of a Final Development Plan for a property, or if it would be applied to properties with existing development. Ms. Wade responded that the staff anticipates that it is most likely to be sought for areas that do not have development plans, or are outside of the areas normally reviewed as part of the plan process. Mr. King added that most of the Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts will be in areas that have historically been commercial in nature, and have been zoned as such for decades, so it is unlikely that the Planning Commission will review those requests. He emphasized that the designation will not be applied to single properties, but to entire districts, with crossing streets as boundaries. Ms. Wade added that there is a minimum size for each district, and that Council specified a specific number of linear feet of street frontage as one of the requirements.

Ms. Roche-Phillips asked if there was any way to incorporate Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts as an overlay within the zoning regulations. Mr. King answered that that option was considered. However, since no issue other than parking was proposed to be addressed with this creation of a special district, the general consensus was that creating an overlay zone would overly complicate the issue. Mr. King added that the Department of Law was comfortable with Council having the ability to create a district in this manner, rather than via the creation of a new zone, which could have taken six months to a year.

Action: A motion was made by Ms. Beatty, seconded by Mr. Penn, and carried 9-0 (Berkley and Wilson absent) to approve ZOTA 2012-12.

VI. COMMISSION ITEMS

- A. CANCELLATION OF WORK SESSION – A motion was made by Ms. Roche-Phillips, seconded by Mr. Penn, and carried 9-0 (Berkley and Wilson absent) to cancel the Planning Commission's August 30, 2012, work session.

VII. STAFF ITEMS

- A. INITIATION OF ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT FOR COMMERCIAL WOODLOTS – Ms. Wade stated that the staff had presented some information about commercial woodlots and the related enforcement issues at a recent work session. She said that Mr. Marx would be requesting initiation of a text amendment to further regulate those uses.

Mr. Marx stated that the proposed text amendment would add commercial woodlots as a principal permitted use in both the I-1 and I-2 zones. Commercial woodlots are currently permitted only as a conditional use in the rural areas, which became a controversial issue about 20 years ago. The lack of regulation of such woodlots in any other zones has led to confusion and enforcement difficulties, which the proposed text amendment should resolve.

Mr. Marx stated that the proposed text was presented at the Commission's work session. Since that time, the staff made two changes to the draft, based on the Commission's input at the work session: first, to limit the processing activities at those woodlots to between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays only; and second, to increase the height of an allowable stack of firewood to 15'. The current height limit for a woodpile is 10' in the rural areas, where there is more space to create multiple woodpiles. In more urbanized areas with limited space, the staff believed that it would be appropriate to allow taller piles. Mr. Marx noted that the Division of Fire and Emergency Services was agreeable to the proposed change in height. He requested that the Planning Commission initiate a Zoning Ordinance text amendment in order to address these issues.

Action: A motion was made by Mr. Penn, seconded by Mr. Cravens, and carried 9-0 (Berkley and Wilson absent) to initiate a Zoning Ordinance text amendment for commercial woodlots.

VIII. AUDIENCE ITEMS – No such items were presented.

IX. MEETING DATES FOR SEPTEMBER, 2012

Subdivision Committee, Thursday, 8:30 a.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	September 6, 2012
Zoning Committee, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	September 6, 2012
Subdivision Items Public Meeting , Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 2 nd Floor Council Chambers.....	September 13, 2012
Work Session, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 2 nd Floor Council Chambers.....	September 20, 2012
Technical Committee, Wednesday, 8:30 a.m., Planning Division Office (101 East Vine Street).....	September 26, 2012

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.

Zoning Items Public Hearing, Thursday, 1:30 p.m., 2nd Floor Council Chambers..... **September 27, 2012**

X. ADJOURNMENT

TLW/TM/CT/BJR/BS/src

* - Denotes date by which Commission must either approve or disapprove request.